

Page Denied

Executive Registry
83-1336/5

Soviet Propaganda Alert

No. 16

October 7, 1983

SUMMARY

Major Soviet propaganda themes and developments from July 1 to September 15:

Need to Improve Propaganda. Party spokesmen demanded more effective propaganda to combat the "unprecedented psychological warfare" allegedly conducted by the West.

See p. 1

KAL Flight 007--A U.S. "Provocation." The USSR brazenly blamed the U.S. for the tragedy, claiming that U.S. had used the flight for espionage.

See p. 2

Arms Control. Soviet media continued to hammer on the theme that the U.S. seeks military superiority and is not interested in equitable arms-limitation agreements.

See p. 5

Madrid Conference. As the CSCE Conference in Madrid drew to a close, Moscow lauded the agreement as a triumph for Soviet diplomacy over U.S. "opposition."

See p. 7

U.S. Scored for Human Rights Violations. Dismissing U.S. leaders' statements as hypocritical, Soviet media emphasized that millions of Americans are deprived of basic rights.

See p. 7

Central America. Drawing parallels with Vietnam, Soviet commentators denounced the United States' "big stick" policy and "undeclared war against Nicaragua."

See p. 9

The Middle East. The U.S. and Israel are "actually working out plans for a direct military intervention and a seizure of oil-producing countries," Soviet sources alleged. U.S. Marines in Beirut are nothing but "occupation troops" with aggressive designs.

See p. 10

Chad. Condemning "imperialist" intervention, Soviet media claimed that the U.S. and France were trying to "suffocate the Chadian people's struggle for freedom." Washington's "threatening" behavior toward Libya was soundly criticized.

See p. 11

THE STRUGGLE FOR HEARTS AND MINDS

Since the Central Committee's Plenary Meeting in June, the Soviet Communist Party has placed heavy emphasis on improving its propaganda techniques (see Propaganda Alert No. 15). On July 14, Pravda carried a front-page editorial, "The Struggle for Hearts and Minds," that stated:

Our times are notable for the unprecedentedly intense and acute confrontation of two diametrically opposed world outlooks, two political courses--socialism and imperialism. Making their main gamble the attainment of military superiority and an unrestrained arms race, the United States and the NATO countries are mounting desperate hostile campaigns and waging an unprecedented "psychological war" against the Soviet Union and the states of the socialist community.

Although the "voice of Moscow, the voice of truth and reason, reaches many corners of the planet," Pravda noted that

our foreign political propaganda is not yet succeeding fully in surmounting the barricade of anti-socialist prejudice with which the West's ruling circles surround their peoples. Sometimes the information is late, sometimes events are commented on superficially, and as a result we have no longer to persuade but to dissuade the listener or reader, which is much more difficult. Our ideological institutions and cadres...are urged to strive persistently to boost the combativeness, convincingness, currency, and attractiveness of our foreign political propaganda.

Steps must also be taken to improve "counterpropaganda" within the USSR. "It is necessary," Pravda emphasized, "to cultivate in every Soviet citizen unwavering ideological conviction and vigilance, a unique sort of 'immunity' to any manifestations of hostile views." Toward this end, it called on party organizations to "take a principled stand against the actions of people who consciously or unconsciously echo alien sentiments" and urged "a more careful approach to the selection of foreign intellectual output obtained through cultural exchanges."

Concurrently, Soviet media continued to lambaste U.S.-sponsored radio broadcasts and the USIA. As if to justify the USSR's jamming of Western broadcasts, Izvestiia (July 11) charged that "the subversive, provocative radio propaganda...can be viewed as nothing but a flagrant violation of international law." "Washington is raising anti-Soviet propaganda to a qualitatively new level," Pravda asserted (July 12), citing sharp increases in funding for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and the launching of Project Democracy. Allegedly at the center of this campaign is USIA Director Charles Wick, "the general of disinformation," who strikes "the highest hysterical notes in the 'psychological war'" (TASS, August 22).

SOVIET REACTION TO THE DOWNING OF KAL FLIGHT 007

The USSR's treatment of the Korean airliner's destruction is a striking example of its resort to disinformation and deception. Soviet authorities released no word on KAL Flight 007 until 12 hours after the plane was shot down. The first TASS report, datelined Tokyo at 0605 GMT on September 1, observed only that a KAL passenger plane en route from New York to Seoul had "disappeared without a trace." A second report, made 11 hours later, stated that:

Fighters of the anti-aircraft defense, which were sent aloft towards the intruder plane, tried to give it assistance in directing it to the nearest airfield. But the intruder plane did not react to the signals and warnings from the Soviet fighters and continued its flight in the direction of the Sea of Japan.

That same day Secretary of State George Shultz accused the USSR of shooting down the plane and demanded an explanation. Not until September 6, however, did the Soviet Union finally acknowledge that its interceptor "fulfilled the order of the command post to stop the flight" of KAL 007.

A U.S. "Provocation"

Rather than accept responsibility for the destruction of the plane and the death of its 269 passengers and crew, the USSR --backed up by its East European allies--launched a propaganda campaign that attempted to shift the blame to the U.S. From September 2 on, it stressed the following points:

- o The violation of Soviet airspace by KAL Flight 007 was a premeditated "provocation" masterminded by the CIA and other U.S. intelligence services.

-3-

- o The U.S. sought to test Soviet air defenses, conduct espionage, and--if the plane were shot down--foment a worldwide outcry against the USSR, sabotage the arms-control negotiations, and intensify its military buildup.
- o The incident was timed "perfectly" to precede the final CSCE meetings in Madrid, the resumption of arms-limitation talks in Geneva, and debate in the U.S. Congress on the military budget.
- o The U.S. acted with callous disregard for the loss of life that was likely to result from its actions.
- o Soviet pilots acted honorably and in accordance with international codes in defending the USSR against an intruding aircraft.
- o The U.S. alone was responsible for this tragedy. But instead of admitting its guilt, the U.S. sought to divert attention from its misdeeds and to whip up anti-Soviet hysteria.

According to Soviet accounts, KAL 007 entered Soviet airspace under mysterious circumstances after passing near a U.S. RC-135 reconnaissance plane. It flew with its navigation lights off and emitted electronic signals characteristic of planes on espionage missions. It did not respond to standard warnings (radio calls, flashing lights, wiggling of wings, warning shots).

Such actions, the Soviets charged, could not have happened by chance. They pointed out that the Boeing 747, equipped with modern computerized navigation equipment, was unlikely to err. In a vein typical of Soviet propaganda, Izvestiia commentator Melor Sturua asserted (September 7):

More and more new information is coming in literally every day to indicate that the CIA's hands, the Pentagon's hands, and...the hands of the U.S. military-industrial complex programmed the tragic loss of the South Korean airliner, sacrificing its passengers on the altar of the selfish interests of the U.S ruling circles.

Supporting this claim, the Soviet media cited testimony from Westerners who alleged that U.S. secret services employ civilian airplanes for espionage or as a "cover" for reconnaissance planes that hover above them, shielding themselves from Soviet radar.

After the U.S. made public the recorded conversations of the Soviet fighter pilots, Soviet media cited evidence purportedly showing that the plane had deliberately gone off course and

that a cover-up was now occurring. In an attempt to put the U.S. on the defensive, Soviet commentators repeatedly charged that the Reagan Administration avoided answering key questions: Why did the plane fly 500 km. into Soviet airspace and pass over extremely sensitive military installations? Why did U.S. tracking stations not warn the aircraft or notify the Soviet authorities? Why did the U.S. and Japan not release tapes of the communications between KAL 007's pilot and its control station on the ground?

Some commentators went so far as to assert that President Reagan himself was directly involved. Referring to the President's remark that "no one will ever know" what caused the plane to stray from its path, Vitalii Kobysh stated on Moscow TV, September 15: "This statement is irrefutable proof that he, Reagan, knew--and could not fail to know--of the American special services' plans and, therefore, is guilty of the death of the passengers of the aircraft."

Top Soviet political figures played a relatively minor role in presenting the official line. CPSU General Secretary Iurii Andropov said nothing publicly about the incident, and comments by Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, who was compelled to address the issue at the Madrid meetings, were only cited in passing in the Soviet domestic media. On the other hand, Soviet media gave prominent coverage to a number of military officials. Particularly noteworthy was September 9's extraordinary two-hour press conference in Moscow that featured Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, chief of staff of the Soviet armed forces. The conference was transmitted abroad by the Soviet and East European Intervision TV network and received much play in the domestic press. Domestic reporting, however, carefully omitted the embarrassing, skeptical questions raised by Western correspondents.

Ogarkov disclosed that on the day of the downing, the Soviet government established a special state commission. Its report, he emphasized, fully supported the government's contention that "the intrusion...was a thoroughly planned intelligence operation."

During the first half of September, the Soviets stuck to this line, brazenly repeating that the United States alone is to blame for this tragedy. As Moscow Radio put it in an English-language broadcast to North America, September 9: "Another 269 people have been added to the number of victims of U.S. imperialism and its tool, the CIA."

Such crude distortions strongly suggest that the CPSU leadership's main concern has been to justify the actions of the military to its own people and to its allies abroad. Support of the armed forces appears to have been given precedence over the USSR's credibility and image as a country devoted to peace and deserving of respect in the world community.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT

In the months before the KAL incident, the USSR directed a heavy propaganda barrage at world opinion, continuously stressing U.S. aggressive intent and the peace-loving character of its own policy. Moscow claimed to have made far-reaching proposals to freeze and reduce stockpiles of nuclear weapons, establish nuclear-free zones in Europe, and prevent an arms race in space. Simultaneously, the Soviets charged that the Reagan Administration's alleged obsession with ensuring U.S. military-strategic superiority over the USSR not only precludes genuine arms control, but also indicates that the Pentagon is "planning a surprise attack on the socialist community" (Pravda, August 24).

Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF)

The Soviet destruction of KAL 007 cast a shadow over the INF negotiations that resumed on September 6 after a two-month recess. Throughout the recess the Soviets maintained keen opposition to the proposed U.S. deployment of 572 new cruise and Pershing II missiles scheduled to begin in December in Western Europe, claiming that the new missiles would shatter the present "parity." The Soviets categorically reaffirmed that the USSR would respond with "corresponding countermeasures" once the deployment begins. And as before, they were adamant in insisting that British and French nuclear arsenals be counted in the INF negotiations.

Any melioration of the Soviet INF stance which accompanied German Chancellor Kohl's Moscow visit in early July was belied by Defense Minister Ustinov's threatening Pravda interview at the end of the month. If the U.S. deploys the new missiles, Ustinov warned, the Soviet Union

will take retaliatory measures that will make the military threat to the territory of the United States and the countries on whose territories the American missiles will be deployed the same as the threat the United States is trying to create for the Soviet Union and our allies (Pravda, July 31).

Pravda (August 1) extended this threat, emphasizing that the deployment of new American missiles will especially complicate West Germany's relations with the Eastern bloc, and that the military danger to the FRG could grow "many times." Returning to this theme at a September 14 Moscow press conference, Deputy Foreign Minister Kornienko asserted that if the American missiles were installed, the USSR would revoke its "moratorium on the deployment of medium-range means in the European zone" and find additional means to "create the necessary counterbalance to the grouping of NATO nuclear armaments in Europe."

Ustinov and Kornienko forcefully reasserted the Soviet insistence that inclusion of British and French nuclear weapons in INF negotiations was not a "bargaining point" but an "objective necessity" of Soviet security. While adhering to this position, Andropov tried a new tack in late August: In exchange for NATO's not deploying the 572 Pershing II and cruise missiles, he offered to "liquidate" any Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles on its European territory that exceed the 162 British and French missiles. The offer, as first announced, appeared unprecedented in that it would entail dismantling missiles, rather than simply redeploying them east of the Ural mountains, as some Western analysts had speculated. Andropov insisted that his offer was a gesture of goodwill that "makes it clear to any unprejudiced person that the Soviet Union has done and is doing everything in its power to find solutions" at Geneva (Pravda, August 27).

Other Developments

Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START). The Soviets continued to resist U.S. efforts to achieve sharp cuts in the numbers of large land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles that would be permitted to the Soviet Union. Andropov stressed that it is "absolutely unrealistic" of the U.S. to persist in a bid "to convince or compel the other side to break down the structure of its strategic forces and to reduce its basic components while keeping for itself a completely free hand" (Pravda, August 18). Furthermore, Pravda (August 16) criticized the U.S. START position as being "set in concrete," and claimed that current U.S. proposals would result in substantial increases of nuclear warheads over current levels.

Chemical and Biological Warfare (CBW). The U.S. Senate's approval of binary chemical weapons production constitutes, according to TASS (July 14), convincing evidence of the Reagan Administration's "program of preparation for chemical and germ warfare." TASS also labeled U.S. efforts to convince the world that the Soviets have been using chemical and toxin weapons in Southeast Asia a "slanderous hullabaloo" designed to perpetuate the arms race and help gain passage of CBW funds in Congress.

Weapons in Space. The USSR castigated the U.S. for planning to extend the arms race into outer space. Andropov reaffirmed the Soviet commitment "not to be the first to put into outer space any type of antisatellite weapon," and proposed a ban on such weapons and a prohibition of the use of force in outer space (Pravda, August 18). Moscow attributed Washington's "negative attitude" toward these proposals to the Pentagon's plans to deploy an antisatellite system that would "disarm the Soviet Union in the face of the American nuclear threat" (Moscow World Service, August 24).

Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR). The USSR reiterated its contention that the West's raising of academic arguments and verification issues were "pretexts for blocking any agreement" (TASS, August 25).

CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE (CSCE)

In July, nearly eight years after the signing of the Helsinki Final Act and after almost three years of negotiations, the 35 nations participating in the Madrid conference reached agreement on a draft document. Soviet media portrayed the accord as a victory for the USSR's persistent diplomacy in the face of U.S. opposition. Observed Radio Moscow (July 8):

It is no secret that from the very outset the Madrid meeting did not enjoy Washington's favor. The Reagan Administration quite simply wanted to bury it quickly under various pretexts so as to rid itself once and for all of the policy of detente and to untie its own hands. But it...was prevented in this not just by ourselves, the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, but other Western countries.

In commenting on the final meetings, Soviet media alleged that the U.S. was using the KAL 007 incident as another pretext to obstruct the talks, but that it did not succeed.

HUMAN RIGHTS

As the Madrid conference moved toward a close, the USSR lashed out at the United States for alleged rights violations. A full-page Pravda editorial "On Human Rights--Authentic and Fake" (July 18) decried the fact that the Reagan Administration is "mobilizing all forces--including the forces of reaction in countries which are Washington's allies in aggressive military blocs--for a 'crusade' against real socialism." No one should be misled by the U.S. leaders' rhetoric, the newspaper averred:

The organizers of this "crusade" have printed on their anti-communist banners the slogans "For Democracy! For Human Rights!" But the false glitter of the banners and armor of the "crusaders" of anticommunism can only dazzle simpletons.

After presenting a lengthy catalog of the economic, social, and political rights enjoyed by Soviet citizens, Pravda contrasted them with the "inalienable rights" that supposedly exist in the United States--where millions of citizens are unemployed or living below the poverty level, and millions more suffer from

malnutrition, occupational diseases, inadequate housing, and rampant crime. "What a happy country!" Pravda caustically declared.

The U.S. government, according to Pravda, not only deprives millions of such basic rights, but also:

- Refuses to sign or ratify international conventions on economic, social, cultural, and political rights, on the prevention of genocide, on the elimination of racial discrimination and apartheid, etc.
- Pursues a policy aimed at crushing "political dissidence," allegedly documented in a report by the American Civil Liberties Union.
- Allows free rein to fascists and neo-Nazi organizations, such as the Ku Klux Klan, while harboring thousands of Nazi war criminals.
- Keeps practically the entire population under surveillance with its secret police.
- Suppresses labor unions that stand up for workers' rights.

In much the same vein, TASS (July 20) responded to President Reagan's proclamation on the eighth anniversary of the Helsinki Accords, pointing out that the U.S. is a country where

the police and national guard stage bloody pogroms in cities' black ghettos when their inhabitants--driven to despair by their poverty, lack of rights, and racist terror--dare to protest against the existing system. According to Andrew Young, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, hundreds and thousands of political prisoners are languishing in U.S. prisons.

Attacks on Andrei Sakharov

The position of the USSR's leading dissident, Andrei Sakharov, stands in sharp contrast to Soviet platitudes on human rights. In an open letter to U.S. physicist Sidney Drell published in Foreign Affairs, Sakharov openly challenged the official Soviet position on arms control. On July 2, Izvestiia carried the article "When Honor and Conscience are Lost" written by four academicians. Although the authors said that they already knew that "Sakharov tries to blacken everything that is dear to us and slanders his own nation," they expressed shock and outrage at his new article. Sakharov, they claimed, is "urging the use of the monstrous power of nuclear weapons in a bid to try to intimidate the Soviet people once again, to make our country capitulate to an American ultimatum." The scientists voiced a veiled threat: "Our state and our people have been more than

patient with regard to this man, who is calmly living in the city of Gorky from which he distributes his misanthropic works." They did not mention, of course, that Sakharov is in Gorky against his will, is not allowed to emigrate, is prevented from receiving medical care in Moscow, and is harshly persecuted for expressing views at odds with the official line.

REGIONAL ISSUES

Central America

Moscow scoured America's "flagrant interference" in Central America. While dismissing American claims of Soviet and Cuban intrigues as "hackneyed disinformation," Soviet commentaries warned of an imminent U.S.-backed invasion of Nicaragua to overthrow the Sandinista government. The Soviets also scored Washington's Caribbean Basin Initiative, calling it an undisguised attempt to perpetuate Caribbean states' subjugation as "agrarian, raw-material appendages of the U.S." (TASS, August 6).

The Reagan Administration's "undeclared war" against Nicaragua, as depicted by Soviet media, contains several elements:

- o military pressure from the "iron triangle" consisting of El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala under U.S. aegis and the U.S.-sponsored maneuvers ("Big Pine II") that began in Honduras in August near the Nicaraguan frontier.
- o "gunboat diplomacy," illustrated by the dispatch of U.S. warships to Nicaraguan coastal waters in late July allegedly to organize a naval blockade.
- o covert operations in the territory of Nicaragua by counter-revolutionary Somozaist agents financed, trained, and equipped by the C.I.A.
- o economic subversion, most recently shown by the U.S. refusal to buy Nicaraguan sugar and to extend credits.
- o "psychological warfare," implemented by both the Voice of America and transmitters in countries neighboring Nicaragua.
- o maintaining servile puppets who will respond obediently to Washington's bidding. Thus, Moscow attributed the Guatemalan coup in early August to U.S. machinations: General Rios Montt had failed to suppress the guerrilla movement in the country, so Washington replaced him with General Mejia, "a rabid anticommunist and goon," who would implement U.S. military plans (Sovetskaia Rossiia, August 11).

Soviet media often drew analogies between U.S. involvement in Vietnam in the early 1960s and present American activities in Central America. For example, according to a Russian-language broadcast (June 30), two U.S. ships off the coast of Nicaragua sought to provoke an incident similar to the one in the Gulf of Tonkin 19 years earlier. "The hotheads in Washington", the report continued, plan to turn Honduras into "a bridgehead to suppress the liberation movement in Central America, as it once did to South Vietnam, and to overthrow the Sandinista Government in Nicaragua." In a similar vein, TASS (September 9) said that Secretary of Defense Weinberger's visit to Central America demonstrates official Washington's "full approval" of the "policy of genocide implemented by the Salvadoran regime against the peaceful population."

In contrast, the Soviets claimed to be setting the United States an example of noninterference in Central America. In early August, Moscow also went on record in support of the Contadora peace initiative, and asserted that the four members of the Contadora Group were taking a sensible line and advocating a just settlement of the region's conflicts (Pravda, August 3). The Reagan Administration, on the other hand, was accused of trying to "split" the Contadora members by putting strong pressure on them, particularly Mexico (Pravda, August 17).

The Middle East

In Moscow's eyes, the United States' principal objective is to work with Israel to divide and conquer the Arab countries and turn the Middle East into an "anti-Soviet bridgehead." Moscow World Service even stated (July 11) that the U.S. and Israel "are actually working out plans for a direct military intervention and a seizure of oil-producing countries." According to the same source, the American "Bright Star-83" military maneuvers in August were a "flagrant violation of the Arab states' sovereignty and an overt interference in their internal affairs." These exercises, along with alleged U.S. plans to increase sharply the strength of its contingent in the multi-national force in Lebanon, were portrayed as an attempt to impose the Reagan plan on the Arab world and compel Syria to accede to U.S. demands. Stressing the "interventionist thrust" of the "saber-rattling" maneuvers as well as their timing, the army newspaper Krasnaia zvezda (July 9) claimed that because of recent failures in its diplomacy, the United States feels compelled to resort to military operations.

As the Kremlin sees it, Lebanon lies at the center of U.S.-Israeli aggressive designs. The country had been "compelled at gunpoint" to sign a capitulatory agreement that allowed Israel to continue to occupy part of its southern tier and permitted the U.S. to create a "military springboard for aggressive sallies against neighboring Arab states" (TASS, July 20).

Israel's redeployment of troops in August, "obviously with the knowledge and connivance of Washington," was seen by Moscow as a strategic expedient and a "prelude to the annexation" of southern Lebanon (Pravda, September 9). The U.S., in turn, has been widening its military role in Lebanon "under the pretext of 'maintaining peace' in that country" (TASS, August 26).

Responding to renewed hostilities in Lebanon, Soviet media condemned the United States' "creeping aggression" and portrayed American Marines in Beirut as "occupation troops" (TASS, September 12). Soviet observers insisted that the U.S. was preparing to launch a major war in the Middle East. Pointing to reinforcements of the Marine contingent, they argued that U.S. military forces were sinking progressively deeper into the "Lebanese quagmire which they themselves created" (Moscow World Service, September 14). One commentator concluded that the events in Lebanon represent the "germ of a new Vietnam" for the U.S. (Izvestiia, September 4). The Soviets rebuked Washington for blaming Arab countries for the Lebanese strife, and called for an end to American intervention and Israel's unconditional withdrawal from the country.

With regard to Israeli politics, Moscow attributed Begin's resignation to the "bankruptcy of Tel Aviv's aggressive expansionist policy," but forecast no change whatsoever in Israel's "pro-U.S. course" (Pravda, August 30). Moscow TV (September 12) characterized the probable successor, Yitzhak Shamir, as even more of an extremist than Begin, and asserted that the "era of terrorist rulers" would continue in Israel.

The Conflict in Chad

Soviet media regularly scored "imperialist" (read U.S. and French) intervention in Chad, claiming that the West was trying to "suffocate the Chadian people's struggle for freedom," and turn the country into a "bridgehead for aggression against neighboring states" (Moscow Domestic Television, August 10). Expressing the standard Soviet line, Krasnaia zvezda (August 14) dismissed as "fabrications" U.S. accusations of Libyan intervention in Chad.

Soviet press accounts excoriated Washington's pretension to "world gendarme," and described U.S. aid to President Hissein Habre as aimed at expanding Washington's military presence in central and northern Africa, a possible prelude to the partition of Africa (Izvestiia, September 13). Soviet observers repeatedly emphasized that the U.S., wishing to "skim the cream from the Chadian adventure," was pressuring and even blackmailing France and Zaire to intervene (Za rubezhom, August 19-25). On the other hand, a leading commentator also speculated that the U.S. may want to squeeze France out so as bring the continent under its domination (Izvestiia, August 22).

President Reagan's "anti-Libyan campaign" received constant attention in Soviet media. Washington's behavior in the region was portrayed not only as camouflage for U.S. military interference in Chad, but also as a serious threat to Libya itself. Responding to Reagan's dispatch in early August of American warships closer to Libyan waters, AWACs and fighter aircraft to the Sudan, and the "Bright Star-83" maneuvers, Moscow decried Washington's "unconcealed military blackmail" vis-a-vis Libya. These actions, TASS charged (August 7), were designed to provoke an incident that the U.S. could exploit to topple the Qadhafi government, or at least "teach it a lesson."

Other Regional Issues

South Asia. Moscow slammed Secretary of State Shultz's Asian tour in early July, portraying it as a "provocative" attempt to sabotage U.N.-mediated talks between Afghanistan and Pakistan and boost the counterrevolutionaries' flagging morale. Soviet media continued to insist that the U.S. is the "main inspirer and organizer of the 'undeclared war' against democratic Afghanistan," a war the U.S. is purportedly intensifying (Krasnaia zvezda, August 28). In this context, Soviet media claimed that the U.S. was using blackmail to force Pakistan to become both its policeman in Southwest Asia and a potential stopover for troops of the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force. The Soviets attributed widespread domestic unrest in Pakistan to the populace's dissatisfaction with the country's military-strategic alignment and dependence on the U.S. (Tashkent International Service in Uzbek, August 22).

Sri Lankan violence. While condemning "outside interference" in Sri Lanka, Pravda (August 8) dismissed accusations of socialist countries' complicity in the disturbances as "groundless fabrications." The United States, on the other hand, was accused of welcoming the country's destabilization as a means for the Pentagon to gain a foothold closer to the shores of South Asia; to punish Sri Lanka for its activism in the non-aligned movement; and to damage Sri Lanka's relations with India, thereby furthering Washington's "anti-Indian" campaign (TASS, September 13).

Chilean turmoil. In a Spanish-language broadcast to Chile (July 18), Moscow claimed that the U.S. was "openly and shamelessly" intervening in Chile's political life, and attempting to divide the opposition to the collapsing Pinochet regime. Soviet media also scored what they described as U.S. attempts to draw the Pinochet regime into an "aggressive South Atlantic bloc" and "recarve the whole geography of the world" (TASS in English, July 27).

U.S. bases in Greece. Although Soviet media found some positive value in the U.S.-Greek agreement because it provides a

specific timetable for the withdrawal of U.S. forces, they continued to stress that the bases are "hotbeds of tension" and "sources of military danger for the surrounding region" (Moscow Domestic Service, July 15). Izvestiia (July 26) warned that the bases may "continue to be used to implement the aggressive plans of U.S. imperialism in the Eastern Mediterranean."

Aquino assassination. Soviet media were reticent, for the most part, although TASS (August 24) claimed that continuing U.S. use of military bases in the Philippines smacked of a "link between the terrorist act that has been committed and the U.S. special services."

-14-

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Listed below are representative items from Soviet sources on the themes discussed in this report. Translations or summaries appeared in the FBIS Daily Report (Soviet Union) between July 1 and September 15.

PROPAGANDA

"Brigandage on the Air," by A. Grachev, Izvestia, July 11.

"The Struggle for Minds and Hearts," Pravda, July 14.

"Operation to Deceive," by Vitalii Korionov, Pravda, July 29.

Moscow TASS in English, August 22. [USIA Director Charles Wick denounced as "general of misinformation."]

"The Struggle for People's Minds: Strategy of U.S. Ideological Aggression," by Leonid Zamiatin, Literaturnaia gazeta, September 7.

KAL FLIGHT 007

"Provocateurs Cover Traces," Pravda, September 5.

"Political Provocation with Far-Reaching Aims," by Gen. Col. S. Romanov, Pravda, September 6.

"Barbarians and Hypocrites," by Melor Sturua, Izvestia, September 7.

"Siberia, the Boeing, and a Little about Hospitality," by A. Bovin, Izvestia, September 13. [Links KAL "espionage mission" with alleged U.S. plans to invade Siberia.]

ARMS CONTROL

"Dangerous Miscalculations," by Iurii Zhukov, Pravda, July 15.

"You Can't Get Far by Deceit," by Vitalii Korionov, Pravda, July 22.

"Answers by Marshal of the Soviet Union D. F. Ustinov, USSR Minister of Defense, to Questions of a TASS Correspondent," Pravda, July 31.

"Washington's Dangerous Illusions," by Col. M. Ponomarev, Krasnaia zvezda, August 7.

"Reception of American Senators by Iu. V. Andropov," Pravda, August 18.

"Our Country's Goodwill," Pravda, August 29.

-15-

CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

"Madrid: A Continuation of Helsinki," by V. N. Nekrasov, Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, July 28.

"In the Interests of Peace and Detente," by A. Alekseev, New Times, No. 32, August.

"A. A. Gromyko's Speech." [Delivered in Madrid.] Izvestiia, September 9.

HUMAN RIGHTS

"On Human Rights--Authentic and Fake," Pravda, July 18.

Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, August 1. [Reagan's proclamation of a Human Rights Week called a smokescreen for "the crudest violation of true human rights.]

CENTRAL AMERICA

"A Dangerous Undertaking," by G. Vasilev, Pravda, August 9.

"Washington's Military Blackmail," by Vladimir Travkin, Sovetskaia Rossiia, August 11.

"From Big Stick to 'Big Pine,'" L. Koriavin, Izvestiia, August 23.

"'Shield for Democracy' or Sword of Imperialism?" by Dmitrii Volskii, New Times, No. 23, August.

THE MIDDLE EAST

"Trojan Horse and Arab Unity," by V. Midtsev, Izvestiia, July 1.

"Biting Off More Than They Can Chew," by Vladimir Kudriavtsev, Izvestiia, September 4.

"Conversation on Near East Crisis," between G. Musaelian and E. M. Primakov, Sovetskaia Rossiia, September 4.

CHAD

"Chad -- A Critical Time," by A. Bovin, Izvestiia, August 22.

"Africa Is Not Alone at a Testing Time," Za rubezhom, August 19-25.

"Washington's 'Big Stick' Over Africa," by V. Vinogradov, Krasnaia zvezda, August 14.

"The Imperialists' Chad Strategy," by V. Kudriavtsev, Izvestiia, September 13.